§ 5107. Aiding consummation of crime

18 Pa.C.S.A. \$ 5107

Official Comment—1972

This section is derived from Section 242.4 of the Model Penal Code. There is no similar provision in existing law.

्री । ह्राप्टिक के बंदी ज्यानामा क्षेत्र हैं के के व Research References

ALR Library

113 ALR 1179, What Amounts to Conviction or Satisfies Requirement as to Showing of Conviction, Within Statute Making Conviction a Ground for Refusing to Grant or for Canceling License or Special Privilege.

Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 6:2, Aiders and Abettors.

Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 18:54, Aiding Consummation of Crime.

2 Substantive Criminal Law § 13.6, Post-Crime Aid: Accessory After the Fact, Misprision Treatises and Practice Aids

14 West's Pennsylvania Practice A400, Aiding

and Compounding.

Consummation of Crime.

§ 5108. Compounding

Official Comment—1972

養婦というなるのでは、

The state of the s

Under existing statutory law the crime of compounding is limited to certain specified crimes such as treason, murder, rape, larceny, etc. The Penal Code of 1989, § 307 (18 P.S. Rule 315 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure authorizes the court to approve settlement of offenses not alleged to have been committed by force or violence or threat thereof, if the aggrieved party has a civil remedy and it appears that the public This section is derived from Section 242.5 of the Model Penal Code. interest will not be materially affected.

This section also extends existing law to cover any offense, not just the more serious

Penalty: Reduced from 3 to 2 years.

Research References

Encyclopedias

14 West's Pennsylvania Practice C760, Com-

Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 18:55, Compounding.

Treatises and Practice Aids

2 Substantive Criminal Law § 13.6, Post-Crime Aid: Accessory After the Fact, Misprision and Compounding.

5109. Barratry

Official Comment—1972

This section retains existing law as contained in Section 306 of The Penal Code of 1939 (18 P.S. § 4306) without substantial change.

Penalty: Unchanged.

Research References

A Care Com

Treatises and Practice Aids

Encyclopedias

14 West's Pennsylvania Practice B90, Barratry. Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 18:56,

But the growth of the

§ 5110. Contempt of General Assembly

Official Comment—1972

This section is derived from Article II, Section 11 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, which authorizes each House to punish "persons for contempt or disorderly behavior in its

CRIMES AND OFFENSES

Research References

Treatises and Practice Aids

14 West's Pennsylvania Practice C1020, Contempt of General Assembly. Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 18:57,

§ 5111. Dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities

Contempt of General Assembly.

Encyclopedias

- (a) Offense defined.—A person commits a felony of the first degree if the person conducts a financial transaction under any of the following circumstances:
- (1) With knowledge that the property involved represents the proceeds of unlawful activity, the person acts with the intent to promote the carrying on of the unlawful

(2) With knowledge that the property involved represents the proceeds of unlawful activity and that the transaction is designed in whole or in part to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership or control of the proceeds of unlawful activity. (3) To avoid a transaction reporting requirement under State or Federal law.

- (b) Penalty.—Upon conviction of a violation under subsection (a), a person shall be sentenced to a fine of the greater of \$100,000 or twice the value of the property involved
- (c) Civil penalty.—A person who conducts or attempts to conduct a transaction described in subsection (a) is liable to the Commonwealth for a civil penalty of the in the transaction or to imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.

Ca\$e.se.1531:Gx:026684#AWDDPTDoDocument&2

- (1) the value of the property, funds or monetary instruments involved in the ransaction; or greater of:
- (2) \$10,000.
- (d) Cumulative remedies.—Any proceedings under this section shall be in addition to any other criminal penalties or forfeitures authorized under the State law.
- (e) Enforcement.—
- recover the civil penalty provided under subsection (c) against any person liable to the (1) The Attorney General shall have the power and duty to institute proceedings to Commonwealth for such a penalty.
- (2) The district attorneys of the several counties shall have authority to investigate to institute criminal proceedings for any violation of subsection (a).
- Commonwealth and another state. No person charged with a violation of subsection (a) by the Attorney General shall have standing to challenge the authority of the Attorney General to investigate or prosecute the case, and, if any such challenge is made, the challenge shall be dismissed and no relief shall be available in the courts of the Commonwealth to the person making the challenge. (3) In addition to the authority conferred upon the Attorney General by the act of involving more than one county of the Commonwealth or involving any county of the October 15, 1980 (P.L. 950, No. 164), known as the Commonwealth Attorneys Act, the Attorney General shall have the authority to investigate and to institute criminal proceedings for any violation of subsection (a) or any series of related violations
 - functions might relate to persons, enterprises or matters falling within the scope of (4) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to limit the regulatory or investigative authority of any department or agency of the Commonwealth whose
- (e.1) Venue.—An offense under subsection (a) may be deemed to have been committed where any element of unlawful activity or, of the offense under subsection (a) occurs.
 - (f) Definitions.—As used in this section, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings given to them in this subsection:

"Conducts." Includes initiating, concluding or participating in initiating or concluding a transaction.

"Financial institution." Any of the following:

(1) An insured bank as defined in section 3(h) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (64 Stat. 873, 12 U.S.C. § 1813(h)).

(2) A commercial bank or trust company.

18 Pa.C.S.A. § 5111

- (3) A private banker.
- (5) An insured institution as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act (4) An agency or bank of a foreign bank in this Commonwealth
 - (48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. § 1724(a)).
- (7) A broker or dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.). (6) A thrift institution.
 - (8) A broker or dealer in securities or commodities. (9) An investment banker or investment company.
 - (10) A currency exchange.
- An insurer, redeemer or cashier of travelers' checks, checks, money orders or
 - similar instruments.
- (12) An operator of a credit card system.
 - (13) An insurance company.
- (14). A dealer in precious metals, stones or jewels.
 - (15) A pawnbroker. (16) A loan or finance company.
 - (17) A travel agency.
- (18) A licensed sender of money.
- (20) An agency of the Federal Government or of a state or local government (19) A telegraph company.
 - carrying out a duty or power of a business described in this paragraph.

(21) Another business or agency carrying out a similar, related or substitute duty or power which the United States Secretary of the Treasury prescribes.

"Financial transaction." A transaction involving the movement of funds by wire or other means or involving one or more monetary instruments.

"Knowing that the property involved in a financial transaction represents the proceeds of unlawful activity." Knowing that the property involved in the transaction represents proceeds from some form, though not necessarily which form, of unlawful activity, regardless of whether or not the activity is specified in this section.

"Monetary instrument." Coin or currency of the United States or of any other country, travelers' checks, personal checks, bank checks, money orders, investment delivery and negotiable instruments in bearer form or otherwise in such form that title securities in bearer form or otherwise in such form that title thereto passes thereto passes upon delivery.

and any other payment, transfer or delivery by, through, or to a financial institution, by purchase or sale of any stock, bond, certificate of deposit or other monetary instrument "Transaction." Includes a purchase, sale, loan, pledge, gift, transfer, deliyery or With respect to a financial institution, the term includes a deposit, withdrawal, transfer between accounts, exchange of currency, loan, extension of credit, whatever means effected. other disposition.

"Unlawful activity." Any activity graded a misdemeanor of the first degree or April 20 1.50 higher under Federal or State law.

1989, Dec. 22, P.L. 770, No. 108, § 1, imd. effective. Amended 2002, June 28, P.L. 481, No. 82, § 4, effective in 60 days.

171 P.S. § 732-101 et seq.

Historical and Statutory Notes

Act 2002-82, § 4, rewrote subsec. (a), which Act 2002-82 legislation prior thereto read:-- "(a) Offense defined.—A person commits a felony of the first degree if the person, knowing tion represents the proceeds of unlawful activity, conducts a financial transaction which involves that the property involved in a financial transac-

"(1) With the intent to promote the carrying sguise nature, loca-or control of the "(2) Knowing that the transaction is designed in whole or in part: "(i) to conceal or disguise nature, proceeds of unlawful activity; or tion, source, ownership on of the unlawful activity. following circumstances:

"(ii) to avoid a transaction reporting requirement under State or Federal law."

; and added subsec. (e).

Research References

Treatises and Practice Alds

14 West's Pennsylvania Practice D130, Dealing in Proceeds of Unlawful Activities.

> Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 18:58, Dealing in Proceeds of Unlawful Activities.

Encyclopedias

Notes of Decisions

unlawful activity as any felony or first-degree misdemeanor, and targets the dealing in pro-

ceeds derived from any of those various illegal Com. v. Barnhart, 722 A.2d 1093, Super.1998, appeal denied 739 A.2d 539, 559 Pa.

672. United States 5 34

Drug dealing 2

1. Unlawful activity

Expert witnesses 3 Unlawful activity 1

things, felony theft, committed offense which 1093, Super.1998, appeal denied 739 A.2d 539, 559 Pa. 672. Receiving Stolen Goods == 1 Defendant who was convicted of, among other amounted to "unlawful activity" within meaning lawful activities. Com. v. Barnhart, 722 A.2d appeal denied 739 A.2d 539, of statute prohibiting dealing in proceeds of un-

2. Drug dealing

dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities; statute presents explicit language which clearly defines Transacting in proceeds of illegal drug dealing is not required element of statute prohibiting

672. Criminal Law ← 470(2)

issue for which jury did not require expert's clarification. Com v. Barnhart, 722 A.2d 1093. Trial court did not abuse its discretion in excluding expert opinion testimony, by certified public accountant, that defendant could not have understood how to commit alleged crime under statute prohibiting dealing in proceeds of unlawful activity, where testimony would have resulted in confusing mix of fact and opinion on ultimate Super.1998, appeal denied 739 A.2d 539, 559 Pa. 3. Expert witnesses

§ 5112. Obstructing emergency services

- knowingly impedes, obstructs or interferes with emergency services personnel providing emergency medical services to an injured victim or performing rescue or firefighting (a) Offense defined.—A person commits a misdemeanor of the third degree if activities
- (b) Definitions.—As used in this section, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings given to them in this subsection:

"Emergency medical services." The services utilized in responding to the needs of an individual for immediate medical care in order to prevent loss of life or the aggravation of physiological or psychological illness or injury. "Emergency services personnel." A person, including a trained volunteer or a or assigned responsibilities include performing or directly supporting the performance of member of the armed forces of the United States or the National Guard, whose official emergency medical or rescue services or firefighting.

"Rescue." The act of extricating persons from entrapment or dangerous situations which pose the imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury.

1998, Dec. 21, P.L. 1240, No. 157, § 1, effective in 60 days.

Research References

Encyclopedias

the proceeds of unlawful activity under any of the

Summary Pa. Jur. 2d Criminal Law § 18:59,

Obstructing Emergency Services.

HEINONLINE

Citation: 2002 vol. I 486 2002



Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org) Wed Oct 2 10:36:29 2013

- -- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at http://heinonline.org/HOL/License
- -- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. code)

Act 2002-82 486

- Falsely incriminating another.—[A] Except as provided in subsection (c), a person who knowingly gives false information to any law enforcement officer with intent to implicate another commits a misdemeanor of the second degree.
- (b) Fictitious reports.—[A] Except as provided in subsection (c), a person commits a misdemeanor of the third degree if he:
 - (1) reports to law enforcement authorities an offense or other incident within their concern knowing that it did not occur; or
 - (2) pretends to furnish such authorities with information relating to an offense or incident when he knows he has no information relating to such offense or incident.
- (c) Grading.—If the violation of subsection (a) or (b) occurs during a declared state of emergency and the false report causes the resources of the law enforcement authority to be diverted from dealing with the declared state of emergency, the offense shall be graded one step greater than that set forth in the applicable subsection.

Section 4. Section 5111(a) of Title 18 is amended and the section is amended by adding a subsection to read:

- § 5111. Dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities.
- (a) Offense defined.—A person commits a felony of the first degree if the person[, knowing that the property involved in a financial transaction represents the proceeds of unlawful activity,] conducts a financial transaction [which involves the proceeds of unlawful activity] under any of the following circumstances:
 - (1) With knowledge that the property involved represents the proceeds of unlawful activity, the person acts with the intent to promote the carrying on of the unlawful activity.
 - [Knowing] With knowledge that the property involved represents the proceeds of unlawful activity and that the transaction is designed in whole or in part[:
 - (i)] to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership or control of the proceeds of unlawful activity[; or
 - (ii) to avoid].
 - (3) To avoid a transaction reporting requirement under State or Federal law.
- (e.1) Venue.—An offense under subsection (a) may be deemed to have been committed where any element of unlawful activity or of the offense under subsection (a) occurs. * * *
- Section 5. Sections 5516, 5708(1) and 6105(b) of Title 18 are amended
- § 5516. Facsimile [bombs] weapons of mass destruction.
- (a) Offense defined.—A person commits an offense if the person intentionally, knowingly or recklessly manufactures, sells, purchases,

		LTH OF PENN TY OF LANCA CRIMINAL	
			COPY
COMMONWEALTH	OF PENNSYL	VANIA	: :
v	rs.		: No. 5995-2006
LEVI L. STOLI	'ZFOOS 		: : :
		JURY TRIAL	4
	Before:	Honorable H	oward F. Knisely, Judg
	Date :	Monday, May	5, 2008
		Courtroom N 50 North Du Lancaster,	
APPEARANCES:	•		
ASSISTANT	PORTMAN, ATTORNEY The Commo	GENERAL	
	. CONRAD,		
CLYMER &			
Lancaster	r, Pennsylv The Defen	ania 17603	

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (10:00 a.m.) 3 This is the time and date for the THE COURT: trial of Levi L. Stoltzfoos, Number 5995-2006. As I have 4 5 met with counsel in chambers prior to opening court, 6 we're going to proceed first with defense's motion to 7 suppress. 8 Mr. Portman, are you ready to proceed? 9 MR. PORTMAN: Yes, we are, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Please. 11 MR. PORTMAN: Call Detective Dan Licklider to 12 the stand, Your Honor. 13 DANIEL O. LICKLIDER, called as a witness, having been duly sworn or affirmed, 14 was examined and testified as follows: 15 MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, I would ask to 16 sequester witnesses, obviously, sir. 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. PORTMAN: 19 Would you please state your name for the 20 record? 21 Daniel O. Licklider. Α. 22 And by whom are you employed? 23 Α. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Office of the 24 Attorney General. 25 Q. In what capacity?

1 Α. Narcotic Agent 3. 2 And with respect to the case before us, 3 Commonwealth versus Levi Stoltzfoos, are you the lead investigator on the case? 4 5 Yes, sir, I am. I'd like to direct your attention back to 6 Q. 7 March of 2007. Did you have an occasion to meet with 8 Levi Stoltzfoos at the New Holland Borough Police 9 Department? 10 Yes, I did. In 2006. Α. 11 Two thousand six. I'm sorry. 12 And is Levi Stoltzfoos in the courtroom today? 13 14 Α. Yes, sir, he is. Please identify him. 15 Ο. He's to the left of defense counsel in the 16 17 long-sleeve blue shirt. 18 MR. PORTMAN: Note for the record the 19 defendant's been identified. 20 THE COURT: It shall be noted. 21 BY MR. PORTMAN: 22 With respect to your meeting with 23 Mr. Stoltzfoos in March of 2006, who initiated that 24 meeting? 25 Α. Mr. Stoltzfoos.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And how did that contact take place? Ο. The contact started on or about February 23rd. Mr. Stoltzfoos would call the office on numerous occasions and that's how it was initiated. Do you recall about what time the meeting took place? Α. Yes. The meeting took place on or about March 17th, 2006 at New Holland Police Department, borough office. And was that in the morning, afternoon or evening? I don't remember. I don't recall. Now, can you please describe the room in which the meeting took place? Yeah. The room was the -- it was the Council Α. Chambers room. Okay. And who was present for the meeting? Detective Jonathan Heisse from New Holland Borough Police Department, myself and the prosecutor, Stevan Kip Portman. And did Mr. Stoltzfoos appear? Mr. Stoltzfoos appeared. He come in through the side door. And to the best of your knowledge, where did that side door lead to?

1	Α.	Yes, sir.	
2	Q.	And where did that take place, if you recall?	
3	A.	Yes. He turned himself in to the New Holland	
4	Borough Police Department.		
5	Q.	And you were present when he turned himself	
6	in?		
7	Α.	Yes, sir.	
8	Q.	Did you take any statements from him at that	
9	time?		
10	Α.	No, not that I recall. None that I recall.	
11		MR. PORTMAN: No further questions.	
12		THE COURT: Mr. Conrad.	
13		MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor.	
14		CROSS-EXAMINATION	
15	BY MR. CONF	AD:	
16	Q.	Sir good morning, by the way.	
17		Your last name is Licklider?	
18	Α.	That's correct.	
19	Q.	Very well. Is it Agent Licklider, Detective?	
20	Α.	Agent.	
21	Q.	Okay. Agent Licklider, with regard to the	
22	March incid	lent, do you recall what day that was,	
23	March 2006?		
23			
24	A.	What day of the week?	

1 Α. No, sir. 2 All right. If I told you it was March 28th, 3 would that make sense? 4 Best of my recollection, it was on or about Α. 5 March 17th. 6 Ο. March 17th? 7 That's correct. 8 Okay. On that particular date when you 9 had -- you said there were three officers in the room and 10 Mr. Stoltzfoos? 11 Α. No, sir. No. There was Prosecutor 12 Mr. Portman, myself and Detective Heisse. 13 Ο. Okay. Prosecutor and then you two fellows. 14 Okay. You had indicated that Mr. Stoltzfoos 15 had initiated the contact? 16 Α. Yes, sir. 17 So out of the blue, Levi Stoltzfoos called you and said, hey, I want to come talk to you? 18 19 Α. Absolutely. What happened was when we did 20 our search warrants on February 23rd, that night back at 21 the office, Mr. Stoltzfoos called the office and he 22 called every day. Every day he's talking to me. He 23 tried to talk to Mr. Portman. He was talking to our secretary and eventually it led to having the meeting 24 25 down there at New Holland.

Okay. So actually what started this was a 1 Q. search warrant that you guys did is what actually started 2 3 all this, correct? I didn't reach out to talk to him. He called 4 I could care less if he -- and he kept calling us 5 6 and kept calling us. 7 If he wanted to speak with you? Ο. That's correct. 8 9 All right. When he came in for this 10 interview, what statements did he make to you? 11 He produced --Α. 12 MR. PORTMAN: Objection. 13 THE COURT: And your objection, sir? 14 MR. PORTMAN: Your Honor, the issue is not 15 what statements were made. It's whether or not it was 16 constitutional. Exact statements are not at issue. 17 THE COURT: Counsel. 18 MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, we're certainly 19 entitled to know what the Commonwealth expects to 20 present. I'd like to know what, if any, statements were made to determine how they came about getting those 21 22 particular statements. So I'm just simply asking what, 23 if any, statements are they attempting to introduce. 24 MR. PORTMAN: This is not an evidentiary 25 hearing. This is a motion to suppress statements, which

goes to how the statements were obtained, not the 1 2 contents of those statements. 3 THE COURT: Have the statements themselves been given in discovery, Mr. Portman? 4 MR. PORTMAN: They have, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Then I would sustain the 6 7 objection. BY MR. CONRAD: 8 9 Sir, is it my understanding that at that time, he handed you some kind of paper? 10 11 Α. No, sir. 12 How did you -- did you ever receive a 13 statement from him? 14 No, sir. Α. 15 Ever receive a written statement from him? Q. 16 No, sir. 17 Is it your testimony he made no statements to 18 you when he came in for this meeting, though? 19 Α. No, sir. 20 So he did make statements, you just don't 21 want to share them at this point? 22 He read a prepared statement that he brought 23 in his wallet. It was a yellow piece of paper --24 handwritten statement and he read it. 25 Q. Did you then question him about the

CaSese1334C4-026884WAW0DPTD oDocument tot 2-1Fill Eded L111901313Pagege515f 0893 1 statement? 2 Α. I attempted to. What happened when you attempted to? 3 He reiterated some of these statements that he had and then he didn't want to talk. He said his 5 purpose there was to read the statement and he wouldn't 6 7 answer any questions. 8 Did you eventually obtain a copy of that 9 statement? 10 Α. Yes, sir. Where did you receive a copy of that 11 12 statement? When I executed the search warrant on his 13 Α. 14 residence, it was in his room. 15 How can you be sure the statement you Q. 16 recovered is the same one from that day? 17 It was the yellow one that he read from and 18 it was the yellow one that he had in the room. And he 19 was -- as we would give him answers to his questions, he 20 would write on them. And, also, our phone numbers are affixed on the yellow piece of paper. He took our phone 21 22 numbers where to contact us.

So he actually interviewed you?

23

24

25

Yeah. We wanted to hear what he had to say. I could have cared less if he wanted to come in.

He wanted to come in and talk? 1 Ο. He wanted to talk to us and, you know -- so Ż. who knows what he's going to say. Didn't matter to me 3 4 whether he come in or not. You never indicated to him whether or not he 5 had a right to an attorney? 6 7 Not at that time. Α. At any point during the discussion did he ask 8 Q: for an opportunity to leave? 9 10 Α. No. 11 Never asked to leave? Ο. No. 12 Α. If he wanted to leave, could he have left? 13 Q. Absolutely. 14 Α. 15 How long did the meeting take? Q. 16 Approximately a half hour. Α. 17 Did you ever determine his educational Q. background? 18 Your Honor, if we could get 19 MR. PORTMAN: clarification as to the time frame when that question is 20 21 posed, whether it was before or after this meeting took 22 place. 23 THE COURT: I believe that's appropriate. BY MR. CONRAD: 24 25 Before you began talking with him about that Q.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

particular matter, talking with Levi Stoltzfoos that morning, did you find out what his educational background was, how far he'd gone in school? Well, I found out from paperwork, but I mean Α. it wasn't a priority, no. You didn't know if he was an educated man or uneducated man? I saw what he did. He was an intelligent man. Okay. Did you determine whether or not he Q. was under the influence of any drugs or alcohol at the time? I didn't ask him. He didn't appear to be. said he didn't appear to be at the time and I didn't ask him that. I mean for what he did and was doing and I was investigating him for, he wasn't an illiterate for what he did. MR. CONRAD: Court's indulgence for one moment. BY MR. CONRAD: On the day of the arrest, you were there to take him into custody? Yes, I was there. And is it your testimony that he did make statements at the time of his arrest?

He could have. I mean it's nothing much I, Α. 1 best of my recollection, that I took notes of. 2 MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, sir, I know I was 3 objected to earlier on this, but whether or not 4 statements were made at that time the defense is unclear 5 if they were. If they were made, it would be important 6 to know if the Commonwealth intends to introduce anything 7 from the time of arrest and then for me to explore 8 9 whether he was in custody at that point when he made the 10 statement or not in custody. I need to know whether they 11 intend to introduce any statements from the time of the 12 arrest. THE COURT: What would you like to say? 13 MR. PORTMAN: We'll not be introducing any 14 15 statements from the day of arrest. 16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Portman. 17 MR. CONRAD: No further questions. 18 THE COURT: Next witness. 19 I'm sorry. Do you have any --20 MR. PORTMAN: Nothing on redirect, Your 21 Honor. 22 JONATHAN HEISSE, called as a witness, having been duly sworn or affirmed, 23 was examined and testified as follows: 24 DIRECT EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. PORTMAN:

1 Would you please state your name for the Q. 2 record? Jonathan Heisse. 3 4 0. And by whom are you employed? 5 New Holland Police. Α. 6 In what capacity? Q. 7 Α. Detective. 8 And for how long have you been so employed? Q. 9 Α. Eighteen years. 10 Q. Are you familiar with a gentleman by the name 11 of Levi Stoltzfoos? 12 Yes, I am. 13 Is he in the courtroom today? 14 Α. Yes. He's seated next to counsel at the 15 table. 16 Q. And when did you first become acquainted with 17 Mr. Stoltzfoos? 18 I became acquainted with him several years 19 ago. I don't know an exact time, but at least five, six 20 years ago. 21 I'd like to direct your attention back to 22 March of 2006. Did you have an occasion to be in a meeting with Mr. Stoltzfoos, Mr. Licklider and myself and 23 24 you? 25 A. Yes, I did.

And did that take place at the New Holland 1 Q. 2 Borough facility? 3 Α. Yes, it did. And do you remember where that meeting took Ο. 4 place? 5 Took place in our Borough Council Chambers. 6 Α. And do you recall how that meeting came to 7 Q. being? 8 9 My understanding was Mr. Licklider had set up 10 the meeting with Mr. Stoltzfoos. Mr. Stoltzfoos arrived 11 on his own and we all went into the council room. 12 And do you recall -- strike that. 0. How did Mr. Stoltzfoos enter the room, if you 13 know? 14 Came in the front door of the office 15 Α. 16 building, which is opened to the public. We went through 17 the double doors, down the hallway and into the council 18 room. 19 And is the council room open to the public at Q. 20 all times? 21 Well, no, I would say it's not. It's a 22 public facility. It's on the borough side. The police department is on the one side and the borough side is on 23 24 the other. That's where they hold their public meetings, 25 audits, water/sewer meetings, that kind of stuff.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition to yourself, Mr. Licklider 0. and myself and Mr. Stoltzfoos, was there anyone else present while you were in the room? Α. No. Were there any uniformed officers in there? Α. No. And can you describe the layout of the borough room for us? The room has three doors; one door to Yes. the hallway that I described, one door goes into the borough office where the secretaries and borough manager are, and the third door is an exterior door that opens into the parking lot. At any time while you were present -- strike that. Were you present for the entire meeting? Α. Yes. And while you were present, was Mr. Stoltzfoos in any way restrained? No, he was not. At any time during the meeting, did you or Mr. Licklider or myself tell the defendant that he was not privy to leave? Α. No. Q. Did he ask at any time if he was able to

leave or free to leave? 1 2 I don't recall that. MR. PORTMAN: No further questions. 3 THE COURT: Cross. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. CONRAD: 6 7 Good morning, Detective. 0. Good morning, Mr. Conrad. 8 Was Mr. Stoltzfoos ever read his Miranda 9 10 rights? 11 Α. No, he was not. 12 Why is that? Q. He had come in voluntarily. He was free to 13 14 leave at any time he wanted to. 15 You had indicated that Detective -- I'm Q. 16 sorry -- Agent Licklider had set up the meeting? 17 Α. That's correct. 18 Is that your recollection? Q. 19 That's my recollection, yes. Α. 20 So it wasn't set up by Mr. Stoltzfoos? Q. I was only assisting, so I knew there was a 21 22 meeting. They asked to use our facility and I accommodated. 23 24 The communication they had prior to that I 25 really don't know. I assume he set it up. If they were talking back and forth and if it was mutual, I really don't know.

O. Once inside the meeting, did my client approximately

- Q. Once inside the meeting, did my client appear to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs?
 - A. No.

- Q. Did he seem oriented to time and place?
- A. Yes.
- Q. The questions -- who posed the first question?
- A. I believe Mr. Licklider discussed with him why he was there and began. Mr. Stoltzfoos immediately had a list -- he had prepared a list of questions on his own, almost like a statement, and he began into that briefly into the meeting.
- Q. Okay. Why was he there? You said there was a discussion about that. What was said about why he was there?
- A. About the money that was taken from the bank that he claimed was his money and why it was taken.
- Q. Money that was taken from the bank or money he was putting into the bank?
- A. Money ended up being taken from the bank that he had deposited.
 - Q. That the government had seized?
 - A. Yes.

And then you say he went right into reading a 1 Q. 2 statement? He had a list of questions he had posed. And 3 Α. the meeting at the beginning was, you know, basically why 4 you're here, I want to talk to you about that. And 5 within a short time, he announced he had a list and he 6 had questions on his own and he began reading them. 7 Okay. And did you fellows then respond to 8 Q. 9 his questions? 10 Α. Yes. At the conclusion of his questions, what 11 happened then? 12 He was released. He was, you know -- the 13 14 meeting ended and he was free to go. 15 Ο. You didn't take a written statement from him 16 then? 17 It wasn't up to me to take it. It was Agent Licklider's case. I was simply present. I took nothing 18 19 written. 20 Did you prepare a report from that? Q. 21 Α. No, I did not. 22 MR. CONRAD: Thank you, sir. 23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. PORTMAN: 25 Just to clarify, Detective. You said Q.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

released. When did the meeting end? I don't recall the time. The meeting ended basically when everybody was done talking and it was obvious that he wasn't going to really give a full statement or anything. And then did the parties just leave? 0. Α. Yes. And do you recall how Mr. Stoltzfoos left the Q. room? Either went out the side door that's open to the public or back out through the hallway. I don't recall exactly which. MR. PORTMAN: Nothing further. THE COURT: Any recross? MR. CONRAD: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: You may be excused. MR. PORTMAN: You may step down. Your Honor, with respect to the motion to suppress, the Commonwealth would rest. THE COURT: Any testimony on behalf of defense? MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, if I could ask the Court's indulgence again for just a moment, sir? THE COURT: Okay. MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, we have no testimony

regarding the suppression issue. However, with regard to some of the other motions that we're obviously going to argue this morning, there may be a need for me to present testimony based on what the Commonwealth's intentions are. So I guess at this point, I simply reserve the right, as we go into the motions hearing, whether or not to call or present testimony at that time.

THE COURT: But relative to the motion to suppress itself, there is no testimony at this point?

MR. CONRAD: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If I may move on then.

Mr. Portman, motion to quash Count 59?

MR. PORTMAN: Your Honor, the Commonwealth would move to nol pros Count 59 in the Information, I think, which makes the motion to sever and the motion to quash that count moot.

THE COURT: Agreed, Counsel?

MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, yes. If we're going to nol pros Count 59, then, yes, as to the motion number 3, the motion to quash becomes moot as would the motion to sever, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Very well. The motion relative to the return of property is not going to be addressed at this point in time. That matter can be addressed certainly after the proceedings have been complete.

1 As to the motion in limine, for the record, 2 the Commonwealth has indicated that they will not be 3 putting the matters in the motion in limine relative to what we'll call briefly the credit card bust-out, those 4 type of matters, in its case in chief. If issues are 5 raised by the defense, certainly the Commonwealth has 6 7 reserved its right to bring those matters back to the 8 Court's attention and we would face that motion at the 9 appropriate time. 10 MR. PORTMAN: Correct, Your Honor. 11 MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, just so I 12 understand, if I could, sir, just to clarify the record. 13 So the Commonwealth then is precluded from discussing 14 anything to do with the credit card bust-out or any other 15 positive schemes? In terms of buying and selling 16 merchandise, they're precluded from discussing those kind of issues? 17 18 THE COURT: In its case in chief until the 19 matter has been raised, if at all, by defense. 20 Is that your understanding also, 21 Mr. Portman? 22 MR. PORTMAN: Yes, it is, Your Honor. 23 MR. CONRAD: Very well, Your Honor. Selling 24 merchandise, they're absolutely precluded. 25 THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Conrad? Those

are all the issues I think we spoke of in chambers.

MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, to argue the motion to quash Counts 1 through 58, that would need to be argued this morning as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Conrad.

MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, if I could have the Court's indulgence for just a moment here.

Your Honor, we have a number of issues to make with regard to the motion to quash. The statute itself that my client has been charged with is Title 18, 5111, dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities. And, Your Honor, we would move to quash that for a number of reasons, first off being that there is no mens rea requirement that's actually indicated in the statute.

And, Your Honor, the -- in Pennsylvania, this being a relatively new statute, there's been nothing really in terms of research that I can come up with in any way, shape or form to discuss this matter. The only thing I could find on point was actually a federal case in the Third Circuit here in Pennsylvania. United States versus Hill, 167 F.3d -- Third -- 1055, a 1999 case.

A very similar statute that the federal government utilizes is structuring. It's essentially the same statute. And in that, the Court has said that to prove structuring, the government must show the defendant

knew of relative reporting requirements and that he structured his transaction for the purpose of evading those reporting requirements, and that he acted with knowledge that such conduct was unlawful.

Essentially what we have here is all but a strict liability statute. And, Your Honor, we would argue that it's actually unconstitutional in the sense that there's no mens rea requirement here in the statute and therein is an unconstitutional statute.

The federal government in their statute, they've at least laid out a mens rea. And they indicated one has to have knowledge of this, then try to subvert the statute. Here in this particular instance, there's no mens rea. So that would be the first argument. The second argument, Your Honor, would be as to the fact that -- and I think what's noted in the motion is that it's void for vagueness and it would be unconstitutional because it's void for vagueness.

Citing a case called Commonwealth versus

Barud, B-a-r-u-d, it's at 545 Pennsylvania 296, a 1996

case, Court said: As generally stated, the void for

vagueness doctrine requires that a penal statute define

the criminal offense with sufficient definiteness that

ordinary people can understand what conduct is prohibited

and in a manner that does not encourage arbitrary and

discriminatory enforcement.

Your Honor, this particular statute, the way it's laid out is -- we would argue is, in fact, void for vagueness in that hypothetically, if I were to go to the bank today, tomorrow, the next day and deposit one dollar, but my intent was to avoid having to file a form, one of the forms that is required here, then I would then have violated the statute. It seems highly improbable or unlikely that one could intend that result. But given the fact the way the statute is written, that is what could occur. It's void.

How does one -- is there a threshold? How many days does one have to put in -- how many times does one have to go in to put their money in the bank? If an individual were to cash their paycheck and then simply try to deposit their paycheck, but their intention in doing so was that they didn't save up too much at the house, get up to \$10,000, then have to bring it in, that -- Your Honor, that individual could be guilty under this offense. And if that's the case, we'd be arresting most of, if not all of, Lancaster County.

Additionally, I go on to note the statute we would argue also should be found void and quashed in that the statute is over broad. And, again citing the same case, Commonwealth versus Barud, B-a-r-u-d, 545

Pennsylvania 297, a statute is over broad if by its reach it punishes constitutionally protected behavior as well as illegal activity.

The language of the statute in question
literally encompasses a variety of protected lawful
conduct. Again, how do we not prosecute everybody in
Lancaster County that's putting their money in the bank?
If every single person out there is simply saying to
themselves, well, I don't want to get to having \$10,000
here at the house, at which point I have to put it in and
file a form, then this statute reaches out to everyone.

If it's truly about unlawful activities, then if one were out there doing unlawful activities and trying to place the money in, that would be a crime, but here, this statute affects every Mary and Joe Citizen if they're simply putting their money in the bank if they ever even have the thought that they could one day have to fill out a form.

A governmental purpose to control or prevent activities constitutionally subject to state regulation may not be achieved by means unnecessarily broad and thereby invade the area of protected freedoms.

Your Honor, it would be our argument, put your money in the bank any way you want to and that this statute does overreach and get to folks that it ought

not. So accordingly, Your Honor, we would argue that for those reasons, that the Counts 1 through 58 should be quashed.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.

MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Portman, would you like to

respond?

MR. PORTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. And I find myself agreeing with Counsel on one issue. It's a strict liability crime; and, second, that there is a dirt of case law on points raised by the defense. However, being a strict liability crime, they have been held constitutional. They are not unconstitutional just because they are a strict liability.

The criminal conduct is not the depositing cash in a bank. The criminal conduct arises from doing so in a manner so that a bank does not have to -- or a financial institution does not file a form required by other state or federal law.

It's not merely putting the cash in the bank that counts, it's how you do it. That's why it's referred to as structuring. Structuring is a criminal conduct, not depositing the cash. And it would not be a check and if somebody attempted to deposit \$500 in such a fashion as to avoid a bank filling out a CTR, that would

be criminal conduct.

The legislature, in amending the Statute 5111, removed any requirement as to the source of the funds and chose not to put any type of limit on the amount of money involved. So those issues are not relevant for this discussion.

And as far as all of Lancaster County, we could include the entire state. Anyone who structures their cash transactions in a manner to make a bank avoid a CTR form would, in fact, be guilty of criminal conduct.

I submit, Your Honor, that the statute is constitutional on its face and ask the Court to so find.

THE COURT: It's my understanding that having once again reviewed the pretrial motion, we have addressed each of the motions outlined in the pretrial motion that was filed by prior counsel at this point; is that correct?

MR. CONRAD: That is correct, Your Honor.

MR. PORTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, if I could argue in the alternative, sir, in response?

THE COURT: I will allow that.

MR. CONRAD: Arguing in the alternative, Your Honor, if I could, it would be our position that because there is no mens rea requirement at all, that the statute

in and of itself is unconstitutional. However, if the Court were to uphold the validity of the statute itself, then, Your Honor, the defense would argue in the alternative this: If that is the case, then there is a catchall mens rea that is applied under the Criminal Code under Title 18-302. The catchall mens rea requirement would be that of recklessness.

So, Your Honor, in the event that the Court were to uphold the constitutionality of this particular statute, then I would argue in the alternative only, Your Honor, that the mens rea requirement that the Commonwealth would need to meet would not then be a strict liability but rather recklessly, as found in 18-302.

I'm sorry. I can give the Court the citation if the Court would so desire. Well, Your Honor, as to recklessness, it would be 302(b)(3), which acknowledges recklessness. And, Your Honor, if the Court would need case law as to the fact that is the default standard, I can certainly provide that if necessary.

MR. PORTMAN: Your Honor, if I may. I disagree with Counsel's representation that recklessness is the only level of culpability. 302(c), culpability required unless otherwise provided provides a culpability may be established by intentional knowing or reckless

behavior. I submit that in this case, intention and knowing are present and it's not strictly recklessness.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.

As to the motion to suppress evidence, which would be the first of the omnibus pretrial motions, I find that at all times during the occasion in March of 2006, the defendant was not in custody, was informed he was free to leave and chose not to leave. The defendant was not entitled to any Miranda warning. The defendant was not coerced into making any statement, and any statement made by him, especially those items for which he read from his yellow sheet of paper and wrote down answers, was freely and knowingly and voluntarily given, and at no time was he in the custody of either the New Holland Borough Police or the Attorney General's Office of Pennsylvania. Therefore, the motion is denied.

As to the motion to quash, which would be motion number three relative to Count 59, I accept the nol pros of the Attorney General's Office. That issue, therefore, becomes moot.

As to the motion to sever in that Count 59 has been withdrawn by the Attorney General's Office, the motion to sever is, therefore, also moot. I have already ruled relative to the motion of return of property.

And, also, relative to the motion in limine

relative to motion number two, which is the motion to quash Counts 1 through 58, I deny defense's motion relative to quashing those counts.

Are there any other pretrial matters for the Court's attention in the courtroom?

MR. PORTMAN: No, Your Honor.

MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, defense would only ask if the Court were to rule as to what the level of culpability will be so we can address that as part of our case in chief. And, also, I would need that for openings.

THE COURT: Court will take a 30-minute recess at this point in time and I will come back with that particular --

MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. PORTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

(A recess was held.)

THE COURT: The last matter before the Court in the pretrial motions is the motion to quash relative to Counts 1 through 58. As I indicated, that motion is denied. Statute 302 of Title 18 is clear under Paragraph (c) that culpability unless otherwise provided. When the culpability is sufficient to establish a material element of an offense is not prescribed by law, such element is established if a person acts intentionally, knowingly or

recklessly with respect thereto.

That is the ruling of the Court.

Specifically regarding issues raised by

Counsel, I concur with the Commonwealth and not with the defense that the depositing of one dollar by any Tom,

Dick or Harry -- or I believe it was Mary or Joe -- does not violate the statute. Taking a paycheck to the bank does not violate the statute. And, in fact, it is what I'll refer to as the structuring which is what is prohibited by this particular statute. And that's what we will proceed on.

At this point in time, prior to the selection of the jury in this matter, I'm going to ask my bailiff to retrieve from the appropriate panel the questionnaires of counsel to have some time to review those prior to bringing the panel in. So I'd appreciate if counsel would remain here. Mr. Battisti will get the questionnaires, bring them to you, give you some time to review those and then I will have Mr. Battisti bring the actual panel members to the courtroom promptly at 1:30.

So you may take whatever time you would like with the questionnaires once they are here. The courtroom will be open for your use. I will not be on the bench during your review of those questionnaires.

So if you could call for the panel for 1:30

and get the questionnaires, I would appreciate that.

THE BAILIFF: How many would you like?

THE COURT: What's that?

THE BAILIFF: 36, 35?

THE COURT: Why don't we go with 35. That gives us sufficient room. We'll have jurors seated both in the two rows behind you as well as in the jury box for the purpose of voir dire.

MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, if I could, just as a matter that would have come up as a result of this morning. First of all, not to be -- in all deference to the Detective, Detective Heisse had indicated that he knew my client from the past. As a motion in limine here this morning, I only ask that the Detective not be able to indicate that only because that would bring into suspect as to why he would have known him from the past. So I would ask that as a motion in limine here this morning.

MR. PORTMAN: No problem with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Detective, I would direct that subject to your being asked that question by defense counsel and it's an appropriate answer, that you not talk about how you would have known or how long you would have known him prior to the date of that first meeting set up

at Council Chambers.

DETECTIVE HEISSE: That's fine, Your Honor.

MR. CONRAD: One last matter. And, again, just so we have an understanding how we're proceeding through trial, and I would rather do it now, if we could. With regard to the statement that the Commonwealth addressed, obviously they did not put the statement into evidence at this point, just that the Court has ruled that it could come into evidence.

The question would be this: The statement was a written statement made by my client. There are portions that, obviously, the Commonwealth would like to have, there are probably other portions they would not like to have. But I would like to have a ruling up front if they intend to introduce it, we would have the right to have the entire document introduced.

Again, Your Honor, that goes to opening the door. Certainly as we noted and the Court has ruled, the motion in limine prohibits any testimony as to the underlying or where these funds came from, but what is relevant to the case is that gentleman claims that he pulled at least some of these monies out of his bank account prior to the new millennium, and that is addressed in this statement that the Commonwealth has fought to keep in. Additionally, some of the workers at

```
-- the bank workers would have knowledge of hearing
1
2
     similar statements as they dealt with my client.
                  So I don't want to open up the door.
                                                        I don't
3
     want to cause any alarm, but certainly if we're going to
4
     go there, I should at least be able to question about the
5
     statement itself and ask the bank personnel about the
6
7
     statement or things that would confirm that.
                  THE COURT: Is there any objection to either
8
      counsel having me see the statement in advance?
9
10
                  MR. PORTMAN: Not from the Commonwealth, Your
     Honor.
11
                  MR. CONRAD: No objection, Your Honor.
12
                  THE COURT: If there's a copy that would be
13
14
      available to the Court or if you would like a copy made,
15
     Mr. Portman or Mr. Conrad, Mr. Battisti will be more than
     glad --
16
17
                  MR. CONRAD: I think I have an extra copy
18
      here. If you would like this.
                  THE COURT: Are the scribbles in the document
19
20
      as it was seized at the time of the search warrant?
21
                  MR. PORTMAN: If I could just briefly, Your
     Honor, just --
22
23
                  MR. CONRAD: I did not scribble on it.
24
                  THE COURT: Appears to be the same pen,
25
     but --
```

```
MR. PORTMAN: Yes, Your Honor, they should be
1
2
     on the original, which we have just confirmed with
3
     Counsel.
                  THE COURT: Did you want to respond at all,
 5
     Mr. Portman, to Counsel's request?
 6
                  MR. PORTMAN: I have no objection, Your
7
     Honor, to his request to get into the entire document.
 8
                  THE COURT: Very well.
 9
                  MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank
10
      you.
                  THE COURT: Again, if you would just remain
11
      until you get the materials from Mr. Battisti, then we'll
12
13
      reconvene at 1:30 for the selection of the jury.
14
                  MR. PORTMAN: Thank you very much, Your
15
     Honor.
16
                  MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
                  MR. PORTMAN: Your Honor, if I may, will the
18
      courtroom be locked during the lunch recess?
19
                  THE COURT: Yes, it will be. As soon as you
20
      gentlemen are finished with the questionnaires,
21
      Mr. Battisti will see that everything is locked up.
22
                  MR. PORTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
23
                  MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
                  (The luncheon recess was held.)
25
```

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N (1:40 p.m.) THE COURT: Good afternoon. My name

THE COURT: Good afternoon. My name is Judge Knisely and this is Courtroom 3.

You've been summoned to this courtroom to participate in a case in which Levi L. Stoltzfoos has been charged with 58 counts of dealing in proceeds of unlawful activity arising out of incidents alleged to have taken place between January 6th and February 11th of 2006 at various locations in Lancaster County in which the complainant is Daniel Licklider of the Office of the Attorney General.

The Deputy Attorney General trying this case today is Stevan Portman and defense counsel is Jeffrey Conrad, who represents Levi Stoltzfoos.

MR. CONRAD: Good afternoon, folks. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: And will be assisted by Leonard --

MR. BROWN: Brown. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: This matter is of gravest importance to both the defendant and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I'm going to discuss with you certain basic principles that apply to a criminal trial and I ask that

you listen very carefully to what I have to say. Later you will be questioned about these principles by myself and perhaps by counsel.

At the beginning, I must tell you that if you are selected to be a member of the trial jury, it will be your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you. That will be part of your oath as a juror in this matter.

It would be highly improper to permit each juror to decide himself or herself what law to apply in the trial of a criminal case. The law which applies in the trial of a criminal case must be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Rules of Criminal Procedure as established by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

It is the responsibility of the Judge to tell the jury what the law is, and it will be your duty to apply the law as I give it to you if you are selected as a member of the trial jury. If you cannot or will not do this, you should not be a juror in this case.

The defendant is charged in this case with certain crimes. The charges are not evidence.

Just because a person has been arrested, held for court by a judge, had an Information issued by the Attorney General's Office and was brought here for trial

is not evidence of guilt. Charges are only charges.

This is because all persons who come before the Court for trial are presumed innocent. And this presumption of innocence remains with them until such time as the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through the Deputy Attorney General, presents evidence in open court which proves the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. What a reasonable doubt is will be explained to you if you are selected to be a member of the trial jury.

At this time, I will just mention that reasonable doubt does not mean beyond any doubt. It means beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden of proof is on the Commonwealth throughout the trial and relates to all of the elements of the crimes charged against the defendant.

In determining the guilt or innocence of the defendant, the only evidence that may be considered is evidence that comes from the witness stand here in open court. The charges themselves are not evidence of guilt.

It is unlikely, but some of you may have read about this case or you may have heard about this case.

If so, you must put that out of your minds, especially anything that came out of the newspapers or any kind of publication, because if you are selected to be a juror for this trial, it will be your duty to decide this case

solely and entirely on the basis of the evidence offered from the witness stand.

The law says that a defendant is presumed innocent until such time as the Commonwealth proves beyond a reasonable doubt his guilt, and that cloak of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the entire trial and right into the jury room where the jury begins to deliberate on its verdict. That is the principle which each of you must accept or you should not serve as a juror in a criminal case.

There is another important point of constitutional law that I want to explain to you. The defendant does not have to produce any evidence in his defense; neither does the defendant have to take the witness stand. This must clearly be understood and accepted by you.

Every criminal defendant has a constitutional right to say to the Attorney General, you made the charges, you have the burden of proving them, go ahead and try and do that. You must understand that a defendant does not have to testify or produce evidence, and that during the trial the jury may not draw any inference adverse to the defendant if that turns out to be the situation in this case. Jurors must keep a completely open mind during the trial with respect to

guilt or innocence of the defendant until all of the evidence has been presented, until the lawyers have made their closing speeches and until I've instructed the jurors in the law which they will apply to the facts as they find them. Until then, members of the jury will not be sufficiently informed about this case to deliberate on their verdict.

Some of you may say to yourselves, well, before I could make up my mind, I would have to hear both sides. That is not proper in a criminal case because as I have explained to you, the defendant does not have to present any evidence. He does not have to take the witness stand himself. He does not have to present his side and the jury cannot hold that against him. The burden is on the Commonwealth to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt by its own evidence.

If the Commonwealth's evidence does not convince the jury that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the verdict of the jury must be not guilty even though the defendant did not take the stand and did not present any evidence. Of course, if the defendant chooses to take the stand or if the defendant does present evidence, the jury may also consider that evidence in determining whether or not the Commonwealth has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable

doubt.

some of you may be concerned about the nature of the charges against the defendant which are entitled dealing in proceeds of unlawful activity. I must tell you that if you are selected as a member of the trial jury, it will be no part of your duty to consider the nature of the charges. By that I mean if a different charge could have been made in this case, the only function of the jury will be to determine fairly and impartially from the evidence presented in this case whether any of the crimes charged have been committed and, if so, whether or not the defendant committed any of those crimes.

Jurors have the duty of determining what the facts are in a case. To do so they have to pass upon the credibility; that is, the believability of the witnesses in the case. What were their opportunities to see, hear and to understand?

No one comes before a jury with a ticket entitling him or her to be believed. The jury is the final and only authority to determine who is to be believed and to what extent.

The trial jury may not consider the credibility -- that is, the believability -- of any particular witness by any different standard than it

determines the credibility of any other witness in a case. When a witness is called by the Attorney General's Office or by the defendant, the witness' credibility as to truthfulness and accuracy is to be evaluated by the same standards.

For example, the jury should not believe the testimony of a law enforcement official just because that person is a law enforcement official, nor should the jury disbelieve the testimony of a law enforcement official just because that person is a law enforcement official. The jury should evaluate the credibility and the testimony of a law enforcement officer in the same way and to the same extent as the testimony of a civilian.

We'll soon begin the actual selection of the jury for this trial, but before we do I would like to caution you concerning one matter. Starting now and regardless of whether or not you are selected as a juror for the trial of this case, you are not to discuss this case with any of the people involved in it, with anyone, not even among yourselves, until you retire to deliberate upon your verdict. Just do not speculate or talk about it.

Certainly do not permit anyone to speak with you about this case. If someone does try and engage you in a discussion about this case, do not answer, but

report that to me immediately so that I may be aware of it and take whatever steps are necessary to ensure a fair and impartial trial.

You must also carefully avoid reading, watching or listening to any news accounts of the case or the trial. The case must be decided solely upon what you see and hear in this courtroom during the course of this trial.

From this panel or any additional panels, if necessary, 14 jurors will be selected by the Commonwealth and the defendant. Of these 14 jurors, the first 12 will constitute the jury for the trial. The other two will be alternate jurors who will serve only if one of the original jurors is unable to serve until the end of the trial. If the original 12 are intact at the time the jury is about to retire to deliberate upon the verdict in this case, those 12 will decide the matter of guilt or innocence of the defendant and the alternate jurors will be excused.

If you are going to go -- I'm sorry. We are going to go through the selection procedure here, which is routine in the sense that this is what occurs in the preparation of all jury trials in criminal cases. The objective is to be able to obtain a fair and impartial and unprejudiced jury. It's for that reason that you

will be questioned about your background, your activities, your knowledge and so forth. No one should deliberately attempt to avoid serving on this jury nor to make a special effort to get on this jury.

You'll be asked a series of questions that are designed to disclose if you're qualified to serve as a juror in this case and whether or not you should be excused for cause. Please bear in mind that these questions are not intended to be an invasion of your privacy or an improper inquiry into personal affairs.

This is an important procedure that is simply a necessary part of the preparation for the trial of this case. You should answer the questions that are put to you with complete candor and honesty.

In addition to being excused by the Court for cause, the Attorney General and the attorney for the defendant each shall have a right to a limited number of what are called peremptory challenges. That is the right counsel may use to exercise to excuse jurors without disclosing any reason for doing so.

Your answer to the questions I'm about to address to you will indicate how you should be further questioned by them as to your qualifications to be members of the trial jury when you are later questioned individually.

I will now direct the clerk to collectively swear or affirm the entire panel of prospective jurors for voir dire.

(The jury panel was sworn.)

THE CLERK: You may be seated.

THE COURT: Thank you. Members of the panel, if any of the questions which I'm about to ask applies to you in any way, you should rise and when asked, to provide your juror number. Remain standing until you are given leave to resume your seat. If no member of the panel rises, I will conclusively assume that the question does not apply to any member of the panel.

It is most important that if any of these questions do apply to you, that you rise and identify yourself to the Court. If you are not certain as to whether these questions do or do not apply to you, you should rise and respond to a particular question so that it can be explored later.

Please remember that you are under oath to rise if any of the questions apply to you in any way. If you fail to rise when you should, it may constitute contempt of court or perjury.

As I said, I will ask you questions as a group. We'll not ask for individual responses initially. If a question applies to you, you will rise, give your

juror number when asked, and I will discuss with you individually how the question applies with you. Counsel for both sides may also pursue the answers you have given to my questions and may ask some other questions.

Again, I want to emphasize that no one's attempting to embarrass you, and I am certain that the great majority of the questions and answers will not be embarrassing to anyone. However, if there is any particular question that you are asked that you would rather not answer in open court but at sidebar, all you have to do is indicate that you would rather answer at sidebar.

Now, again, as I ask these questions, if they apply to you, just simply rise. We'll give you an opportunity and I will point to you and we'll just ask you for your number, and then all of us will have the opportunity to jot that number down. Okay.

Is any member of the panel under the age of 18, or is any member of the panel not a citizen of the United States or not a resident of Lancaster County?

Has any member of the panel been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment of more than one year and has not been granted a pardon or amnesty for that offense? If any of those things apply to you, please rise.

1 A JUROR: Ninety-six. 2 THE COURT: Ninety-six. Thank you. Next question, is any member of the panel 3 unable to understand the English language or do any of 4 you have any difficulty in understanding the English 5 6 language? If so, please rise. I see no response. 7 Do any of you have any physical, mental or emotional disability which would make it difficult for 8 9 you to hear and concentrate upon the testimony of the witnesses in this case? If so, please rise. 10 11 A JUROR: I have a hearing problem. 12 THE COURT: Just your number, sir. 13 A JUROR: One twenty-six. 14 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 15 The defendant in this case is Levi L. 16 Stoltzfoos. Mr. Stoltzfoos, would you rise so that they 17 can see you from both directions please. 18 Counsel for Mr. Stoltzfoos is Jeffrey Conrad. 19 I had introduced him earlier. 20 The name of the Deputy Attorney General who 21 will represent the Commonwealth in this case is Stevan 22 Portman. 23 Are any of you related by blood or marriage 24 or do any of you have a close association with the 25 defendant, the defense counsel or the Deputy Attorney

```
General? If so, please rise. I see no response.
1
                  I will now ask the Deputy Attorney General to
2
     tell you the names of the witnesses that he may call,
3
     persons whose names may be mentioned in the trial of this
4
     case. If any of you are related by blood or marriage or
5
     have a close association with any of those potential
6
     witnesses, I'm going to ask you to rise once he has given
7
8
     that list of witnesses to you.
                  (Reporting of the voir dire is waived by
9
10
     counsel.)
                  THE COURT: Thank you.
11
                  At this point in time, I'm going to have the
12
     clerk swear in the jury. You will listen to his remarks,
13
     respond appropriately and then we're going to have
14
     Mr. Battisti take you back to the jury room for about a
15
     15-minute break before we begin.
16
17
                  THE CLERK: Would you please rise.
18
                  (The jury was sworn.)
19
                  THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel, at this
20
     point in time, we'll take a 15-minute recess, give
21
     everybody an opportunity to go back.
22
                  Mr. Battisti, if they need a little bit
     longer, please let me know.
23
24
                  (A recess was taken.)
25
                  THE COURT: Members of the jury, you are
```

about to perform one of the most serious duties of citizenship. You're going to decide whether a fellow citizen is guilty of a criminal charge brought by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The way you jurors do your job is as important to the administration of justice as the way I do mine as Judge and the way the lawyers do. Pay close attention to everything that is said and done in this courtroom so that you can perform those duties well.

The Commonwealth has charged the defendant with 59 -- I'm sorry, 58 counts of what is entitled dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities. This charge is made through a formal document called an Information.

An Information is only an accusation. It is not any proof that the defendant is guilty. Under our constitution, the defendant is presumed innocent unless and until he's proven guilty. I'm sorry. The Deputy Attorney General, as counsel for the Commonwealth, has the burden of proving him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

The defendant has the right to remain silent and to present no evidence. You must not hold it against the defendant if he happens to choose not to testify at trial.

I shall describe to you in a general way what

will take place. First, the Deputy Attorney General may make an opening statement in which he will outline the Commonwealth's case against the defendant. The defendant's attorney may make an opening statement outlining the defense's case either immediately following the Deputy Attorney General's opening statement or at a later time in the trial.

Next, the Deputy Attorney General will present his evidence. He may call witnesses to testify and he may offer such exhibits or documents or physical evidence as he chooses. The defense counsel has the right to cross-examine witnesses called by the Deputy Attorney General in order to test the truthfulness and accuracy of their testimony.

After the Commonwealth has presented the Commonwealth's case, defense counsel may present evidence for the defendant. The defendant has no obligation to offer any evidence or to testify himself. The Commonwealth may, of course, cross-examine any witnesses that may be called by the defense.

After all the evidence has been presented, counsel for both sides will have the opportunity to make their closing arguments to you. At that point, I shall give my final charge, which will include the instructions on the rules of law that apply to this case and whatever

additional guidance I think you will need for your deliberations. You will then retire to the jury room to deliberate and decide what your verdict will be.

It is my responsibility to decide all questions of law. You must follow my rulings and instructions on the matters of law whether or not you agree with them. I may give you other instructions during the trial in addition to these preliminary instructions in my final charge.

You should consider all of my instructions as a connected series. They constitute the law which you must follow.

I am not, however, the judge of the facts.

It is not for me to decide what are the true facts about the charge against this defendant. You, the jurors, are the sole judge of the facts.

It will be your responsibility at the end of trial when you deliberate to evaluate the evidence and from the evidence find what the facts are. You will apply the rules of law, which I give to you, to the facts as you find them to decide whether this defendant has been proven guilty or whether he will be not guilty.

While you are deciding the facts of this case, you will have to judge the credibility and weight of the testimony and other evidence. By credibility I

mean truthfulness and accuracy. When you judge the credibility and weight of a witness' testimony, you are deciding whether you believe all, part or none of his or her testimony and how important that testimony is.

Use your understanding of human nature and your common sense. Observe each witness as he or she testifies. Be alert for anything in his or her own testimony or behavior or for anything in the other evidence that might help you judge the truthfulness, accuracy and weight of that evidence.

Each of you must keep an open mind throughout the trial. You should avoid forming opinions about the guilt or innocence of the defendant or about any other disputed question until the trial has ended and you begin your deliberations.

Do not talk with each other about the evidence or any other matter relating to whether the defendant has been proven guilty until I send you to the jury room to deliberate on your verdict. Only then will you know enough about the case, the evidence and the law to discuss it intelligently and fairly. When you deliberate on your verdict, the law allows you to consider only the evidence, arguments and instructions that were presented to you properly.

You must avoid anything that might result or

appear to result in your being exposed to outside information or influences. More specifically, do not talk with anyone else about this case or listen to others talk about this case until the trial is completely over and I discharge you as jurors. Do not even discuss the case with members of your family, close friends or court personnel.

There are some people with whom you should not have any conversation at all, even casual conversation. These people are the defendant, counsel for both sides and the witnesses.

Do not read, listen or watch anything about this case in the newspapers, magazines or on radio or television. Do not try to get information relative to this case on your own. Do not make any investigation, do any research, visit the scene of any of the offenses that are alleged or conduct any experiment. Your only information about this case should come to you while you're all together here acting as a jury in the presence of myself, the attorneys and the defendant.

As I told you earlier, you are the sole judges of the facts and of the credibility and weight of the evidence. You must rely on your own recollection and evaluation of the evidence during your deliberations and not mine or counsel's. You are not bound by any opinion

that counsel or I might express about the guilt or innocence, credibility or weight of the evidence, facts proven by the evidence or inferences to be drawn from those facts.

An inference is a deduction. For example, if everything is wet outdoors, you might infer it had been raining. You should consider the statements and arguments of counsel carefully even though they are not binding on you as they are not evidence. You may be guided by them if the statements and arguments are supported by the evidence and appeal to your reason and judgment.

The questions that counsel put to witnesses are not evidence. The same is true of any questions that I might ask. You should not guess that a fact is true because one of the attorneys or I ask a question about it. It is the witnesses' answers that provide the evidence.

Part of my job is to rule on any objections to evidence made by counsel. If I decide the evidence is admissible, I will overrule the objection. This simply means that you are entitled to hear and consider the evidence. On the other hand, if I decide the evidence is inadmissible, I will sustain the objection. This means that you are not entitled to hear the evidence.

Sometimes I may order evidence stricken from the record after you have heard it. Whenever I sustain an objection or order evidence stricken from the record, you must completely disregard that evidence when deciding the case.

Counsel and I may have to deal with matters that you are not supposed to know about. When one of these matters comes up, counsel and I may discuss it at sidebar, or in front here, or in my chambers or in the courtroom after I have asked you to leave. Please do not try and guess what we are talking about. While we are discussing matters at the bench, feel free to stand or converse quietly among yourselves on any matter unrelated to this case.

Do not concern yourself with what the penalty might be should you find the defendant guilty. The question of guilt and punishment are totally separate questions. If you do find the defendant guilty, it will become my responsibility as Judge to fix the penalty.

Whatever your verdict, it will have to be unanimous to be valid. All of you will have to agree on it or there will be no verdict.

In the jury room, you will discuss the case among yourselves, but ultimately each of you will have to make up his or her own mind; therefore, each of you has

the responsibility which you cannot avoid. You must do your best throughout the trial to fulfill that great responsibility.

As I indicated to you, there will be permitted in this particular case the taking of notes.

Once counsel has finished their opening argument, should both counsel decide to make them today, I will go over with you first thing in the morning relative to the rules and regulations regarding note taking.

Mr. Portman, would you like to address the jury?

MR. PORTMAN: Thank you.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. As I indicated earlier, my name is Stevan Kip Portman. I'm a Deputy Attorney General. I represent the Commonwealth in this case.

I'd like to first free your minds of anything you've seen on television regarding criminal trials.

That is not reality. That is make-believe. Cases are settled within an hour and the good guy always wins.

This is a real, live case.

This involves an allegation by the Commonwealth that beginning on or about January 6th of 2007 -- excuse me, 2006, the defendant, Levi Stoltzfoos, started on a pattern of structuring cash

deposits in banks. That is he took \$540,200 and over a six-week period made 58 separate deposits ranging anywhere from \$5200 to \$10,000 on 58 separate occasions involving ten banks located within Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. And that he did so for one purpose and one purpose only. That was to prevent the government from knowing that he had that money.

If he had made deposits of \$10,000 -- in excess of \$10,000, each bank would have had to fill out a form called a Cash Transaction Report, which is required by the federal government. That puts the government on notice that this money has been deposited and it's cash.

That is the entire case merely in a nutshell. Fifty-eight transactions to avoid having banks do what they're required to do under the law, which is fill out a Cash Transaction Report.

To prove to you that occurred, you're going to hear testimony from Special Agent Licklider from the witness stand regarding how he started the investigation when he received information from the bank -- excuse me, Susquehanna Bancshares from one of their employees that called him and notified him of some activity going on by Mr. Stoltzfoos in the banks in Lancaster County. And that through his investigation, Mr. Licklider obtained, from each of those ten banks, copies of cash-in tickets

and the deposit slips filled out by Mr. Stoltzfoos for each one of those 58 separate transactions. He will identify the documents received.

Then you will hear from bank representatives from each of those ten banks who will testify as to the authenticity of those documents and, in fact, they were presented at their bank, and that Mr. Stoltzfoos presented cash coinciding with those deposit tickets, proof through the cash-in tickets.

Although the statute, as the Judge read, indicates that it's dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities, that's just the name of the statute. What we're alleging in this case is that Mr. Stoltzfoos' transactions, what he did was to avoid the banks filling out a Cash Transaction Report, a report required under federal or state law.

And after you've heard all that testimony, I submit that you will agree with me that Mr. Stoltzfoos' only reason for making those 58 transactions was to prevent the government from knowing about his cash.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Conrad, would you like to open at this time?

MR. CONRAD: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please. Mr. Portman. Ladies and

gentlemen of the jury, it is a pleasure to finally get a chance to get in front of you on this case. Since I was brought on board here to help out Levi Stoltzfoos, I've been waiting for this opportunity to get in front of you folks because you've never heard a case like you're about to hear.

Folks, this young man over here, my client, this is Levi Stoltzfoos. This young man grew up right here in Lancaster County. He grew up in an Amish family. And what you're going to hear is this young man is terrifying the government.

He has worked for 22 years. He lives with his mom and dad who are, in fact, Amish and he's afraid of the federal government. He's afraid they'll take his money. And guess what? They did. I'm sorry, not the federal government. The government. He's afraid they'll take his money and they did.

Why did they take his money? Well, Levi Stoltzfoos wanted to put his money in the bank, cash money in the bank so he could get some interest and buy a truck. So he knows about a form. There's a form as the government pointed out, a banking form. And the banking form has to be filled out for transactions over 10,000 bucks.

Well, here's Levi Stoltzfoos. And you'll

SUSAN A. MILTON, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

hear about an eighth grade education that he has. And, let's see, going to put money in the bank, don't like the federal government, I'll just put it in nine grand at a time or \$9,000, as the government pointed out, \$5,000 or whatever, but he's going to put it in under the limit.

Why? He's afraid of the federal government.

So what's he do? Well, he starts putting his money in the bank. And he went to, here in Lancaster County, numerous banks. And I'm sure, as counsel pointed out, you're going to hear from each one of those banks, banks here in Lancaster County that want to do business with folks. Why? Because they want to collect their money. Sign out a form, I want a banking account, I want a savings account, I want a checking account. That's what I want to do.

Now, you come in, the people you trust, deliver your money. And as you'll hear, he's doing something that apparently is illegal. Apparently if you, in fact, do this and structure your money to put it in this way, it's a crime.

So what you're going to hear is the ten different banks that he deals with and the folks that work at those banks as they see -- and you'll hear the testimony they see this man bringing in the money under the 10,000-dollar limit. Not once does anybody walk up

to this simple man and simply say, sir, if you put your money in that way, it's a crime. You could be incarcerated and they'll take every penny that you own. Every penny. Not once does anybody do that. So he can put his money in like that until one day the police come and arrest the man.

Before today, I'm an attorney. Been an attorney for years. Forty-one years of age. Did you know that was a crime? Dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities. A person commits the offense of dealing in proceeds of unlawful activities if the person conducts a financial transaction under any of the following circumstances: To avoid the reporting under state or federal law.

Man, put my money in under ten grand a couple of times. And guess what? They're going to take it all.

Well, I submit to you folks in this
particular case, this man is afraid of the federal
government and this man wants to put his money in the
bank. And this man does exactly what the Commonwealth
said. He put numerous amounts of money in.

Pictures taken everywhere he goes. He's smiling as he comes into the bank. He's going about his business. Doesn't hide anything. Good morning. Here's my money. Good morning. Over here, here's my money.

Conduct that is criminal, conduct that needs prosecuted, conduct for which this man needs to have all his money taken, it's not in this case.

The Commonwealth has to show that he's reckless. That's the standard you guys are going to hear about. And the Judge is going to talk to you about that. Anything that has to do with the law the Judge will have. Anything that has to do with the facts, you folks will be the final -- you'll have the final say on that. And you're going to get a chance to hear all the facts in this case.

with this case, you're going to find out that this young man did, in fact, put his cash money in, he put it in under \$10,000 and that he did so innocently. No crime. And we'll come back at the end and argue exactly that, that the conduct that Levi Stoltzfoos, one of our people here in Lancaster County, grew up Amish, the conduct that he did, did not rise to the level of the offense that the government has charged him with in this case. And we'll ask you to keep your eyes and ears open and listen to all of it, as I'm sure you will, and we'll come back and argue at the end that he is not guilty of this charge.

Thanks, folks. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, at this

1 time, there will be quite a number of witnesses; many of 2 them, of course, like yourselves, coming from what I'll 3 call professional banking institutions. The reason that I bring that to your attention is solely because we've 4 now heard the opening comments by each side and at this 5 6 point we're going to break for the day. We will begin 7 testimony promptly at 9:00 tomorrow morning. Mr. Battisti will direct you exactly where to be, when to 8 9 be, and also to wear those juror buttons. 10 I'm going to excuse you until tomorrow 11 morning. As I said, trial will resume with taking of 12 testimony at nine a.m. 13 I ask that you report back to the jury room 14 no later than -- Mr. Battisti, what would you like? 15 THE BAILIFF: 8:45. 16 THE COURT: -- no later than 8:45. You're 17 certainly welcome to come earlier than that. 8:30 is 18 fine. 19 Please remember you have now heard just a bit 20 about this case from both counsel. You are not to 21 discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else. You are not to conduct any experiment, visit any scenes 22 23 or make any other individual investigation of any of the 24 facts of this case. You are not to read, listen or watch 25 any media accounts of this case. Please wear your jury

buttons in a conspicuous place at all times when you are 1 2 around the courthouse environs. I thank you for your service so far and we'll 3 see you bright and early tomorrow morning. Thank you 4 very much. 5 (The jury left the courtroom.) 6 7 THE COURT: Counsel, do you expect any 8 preliminary matters before we begin tomorrow morning? 9 MR. PORTMAN: No -- just one. I would ask 10 the Court to address the jury on Mr. Conrad's 11 misstatement of the law when he said that the burden is 12 reckless when the Court in the pretrials ruled that it 13 wasn't strictly reckless. You said it was intentional, 14 knowingly, reckless under 302(c). I'd ask for a 15 cautionary instruction, Your Honor, tomorrow morning with 16 the jury. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any expectation 18 you'll need to see me before we begin testimony in the 19 morning? 20 MR. PORTMAN: No, Your Honor. 21 MR. CONRAD: No, Your Honor. Only my 22 response to that's the lowest standard -- there are 23 three, as the Court will instruct certainly at the end, and that's just simply the lowest. In other words --24 25 only argue there's no need for a cautionary instruction,

```
1
      Your Honor. It's simply the Court will address that
      clearly throughout the trial or at the end of the trial.
 2
                  THE COURT: Very well. Then I would ask
 3
      everybody to be seated at approximately 8:45 tomorrow
 4
      morning so we can begin promptly at 9:00 with the calling
 5
 6
      of witnesses. Thank you all very much.
 7
                  MR. CONRAD: Thank you, Your Honor.
                   (The proceedings recessed at 3:55 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the
4	hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported
5	stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony
6	produced, and I further certify that the foregoing is a
7	true and correct copy of my said stenographic notes.
8	In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed
9	my hand this 17th day of June, 2008.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Susan A. Milton
15	Official Court Reporter
16	AND, NOW,
17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
18	this transcript is approved and ordered to be filed.
19	
20	
21	
22	Howard F. Knisely, Judge
23	
24	
25	

1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	COUNTY OF LANCASTER CRIMINAL DEFENSE ATTORNEY
3	
4	
5	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA :
6	vs. : Number 5995-2006
7	LEVI L. STOLTZFOOS :
8	·
9	TUDY TOTAL
10	JURY TRIAL VOLUME 2 OF 4
11	Before: Honorable Howard F. Knisely, Judge
12	
13	Date : Tuesday, May 6, 2008
14	Place : Courtroom No. 3 50 North Duke Street
15	Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17602
16	
17	ADDEADANGEG
18	APPEARANCES:
19	STEVAN K. PORTMAN, ESQUIRE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
20	For - The Commonwealth
21	JEFFREY A. CONRAD, ESQUIRE CLYMER & MUSSER
22	408 West Chestnut Street Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603
23	For - The Defendant
24	
25	ORDERED 5-16-08 LODGED FILED

1		INDEX	TO WITH	IESSES	
2	VOLUME 2 OF 4				
3	WITNESSES:	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
4	Daniel Licklider Tarah Forsythe		131 159		152
5	Annie Frackman	164	167		
6	Nadine McGarrity Elaine Shope Lana L. Neff	176	179		
7	Linda Lane	185	184 188		
8	Jennie McComsey	190	192		
9	COMMONWEALTH'S I	EXHIBITS		ID	ENTIFIED
10	No. 1 - Applicat				
11	No. 2 - Applicat No. 3 - Applicat	cion for	Search	Warrant	83
12	No. 4 - Applicat No. 5 - Applicat No. 6 - Applicat	cion for	Search	Warrant	
13	No. 7 - Applicat No. 8 - Applicat	cion for	Search	Warrant	86 86
14	No. 9 - Application No. 10 - A	cion for	Search	Warrant	87
15	No. 11 - Applica No. 20 - Yellow	ation for			
16	No. 31 - Deposit	ticket	_		94 95
17	No. 32 - Teller No. 32A - Teller	ticket	- .		95 96
18	No. 33 - Deposit	ticket			96 96
19	No. 34 - Deposit	ticket			96 96
20	No. 35 - Deposit No. 35A - Teller	ticket			96 97
21	No. 36 - Teller No. 36A - Teller	ticket			97 97
22	No. 37 - Deposit	ticket			97 97
23	No. 40 - Signatu No. 41 - Deposit	re card			99 99
24	No. 42 - Deposit No. 43 - Deposit	ticket			100
25	10 Deposit	Julia			

1	INDEX TO EXHIBITS (co	ontinued)
2	COMMONWEALTH'S EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED
3	No. 44 - Deposit ticket	100
	No. 45 - Deposit ticket	100
4	No. 50 - Signature card	101
	No. 51 - Deposit ticket	101
5	No. 52 - Deposit ticket	101
	No. 53 - Deposit ticket	102
6	No. 54 - Deposit ticket	102
	No. 55 - Deposit ticket	103
7	No. 60 - Signature card	103
	No. 61 - Deposit ticket	104
8	No. 61A - Teller ticket	104
	No. 62 - Deposit ticket	104
9	No. 62A - Teller ticket	105
	No. 63 - Cash-in ticket	105
10	No. 63A - Cash-in ticket	105
	No. 64 - Deposit ticket	105
11	No. 64A - Teller ticket	105
12	No. 65 - Deposit ticket No. 65A - Teller ticket	106
12		106 106
13	No. 66 - Deposit ticket No. 66A - Teller ticket	106
10	No. 70 - Signature card	107
14	No. 71 - Deposit ticket	107
* *	No. 71A - Teller ticket	107
15	No. 72 - Deposit ticket	108
	No. 72A - Teller ticket	108
16	No. 73 - Deposit ticket	108
	No. 73A - Teller ticket	109
17	No. 74 - Deposit ticket	109
	No. 74A - Teller ticket	109
18	No. 75 - Deposit ticket	109
	No. 75A - Teller ticket	109
19	No. 80 - Signature card	111
	No. 81 - Deposit tickets	111
20	No. 82 - Deposit ticket	112
	No. 83 - Deposit ticket	113
21	No. 90 - Signature card	114
	No. 91 - Deposit ticket	114
22	No. 91A - Teller ticket	114
	No. 92 - Deposit ticket	114
23	No. 92A - Deposit ticket	114
	No. 93 - Deposit ticket	115
24	No. 93A - Teller ticket	115
	No. 94 - Deposit ticket	115
25		

```
1
                 COMMONWEALTH'S EXHIBITS (continued)
 2
       No. 95 - Deposit ticket
                                                    115
 3
       No. 95A - Deposit ticket
                                                    115
       No. 96 - Deposit ticket
                                                    115
       No. 96A - Teller ticket
                                                    116
 4
       No. 97 - Deposit ticket
                                                    116
       No. 97A - Deposit ticket
 5
                                                    116
       No. 100 - Signature card
                                                    117
       No. 101 - Deposit ticket
 6
                                                    117
       No. 102 - Deposit ticket
                                                    117
 7
       No. 103 - Deposit ticket
                                                    118
       No. 104 - Deposit ticket
                                                    118
       No. 105 - Deposit card
 8
                                                    118
       No. 106 - Deposit ticket
                                                    119
       No. 110 - Signature card, Sovereign Bank
 9
                                                    120
       No. 111 - Deposit ticket
                                                    120
       No. 112 - Deposit ticket
10
                                                    120
       No. 113 - Deposit ticket
                                                    120
       No. 114 - Deposit ticket
11
                                                    121
       No. 115 - Deposit ticket
                                                    121
12
       No. 116 - Deposit ticket
                                                    121
       No. 120 - Account agreement
                                                    122
       No. 121 - Money market deposit ticket
13
                                                    122
       No. 121A - Teller ticket
                                                    122
14
       No. 122 - Money market deposit ticket
                                                    123
       No. 122A - Cash-in ticket
                                                    123
15
       No. 123 - Cash-in ticket
                                                    123
       No. 123A - Cash-in ticket
                                                    123
16
       No. 124 - Money market deposit ticket
                                                    123
       No. 124A - Cash-in ticket
                                                    123
       No. 125 - Cash-in ticket
17
                                                    123
       No. 125A - Cash-in ticket
                                                    123
18
19
       DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS
                                                IDENTIFIED
20
       Nos. 1 through 18 - Photographs
                                                      134
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

(9:02 a.m.)

THE COURT: As you can tell, it's not always the easiest thing driving to the City of Lancaster. I encourage you -- and I know that the radio is not always accurate as to where accidents are and so forth, but please be mindful of that for tomorrow.

The Court has two items that I need to bring to your attention before the first witness is called. First of all, defense counsel, in his opening comments, indicated the culpability in this case is the standard of recklessness. Although that is a correct statement, it is not actually a complete statement. And so I'm going to just read to you very briefly the applicable law.

When the culpability is sufficient to establish a material element of the offense as prescribed by law, such element is established if a person acts intentionally, knowingly or recklessly with respect to that.

We'll come back to that in my final instructions, but I just wanted you to have three possible ways of culpability.

Second, you now have packets on your seats or on your laps and that is regarding note taking. I'm required to give you instructions relative to note

taking, and so I would like you to listen to these instructions and at the end I will direct you as to what you may do with your packets.

You will be distributed notepads and pens in the event you wish to take notes during the trial.

You're under no obligation to take notes and it is entirely up to you whether you wish to take notes to help you remember what witnesses said and to use them during your deliberations.

If you do take notes, remember that one of your responsibilities as a juror is to observe the demeanor of witnesses to help you assess their credibility. Do not become so involved with note taking that it interferes with your ability to observe the witnesses or it distracts you from hearing the questions being asked the witnesses and the answers given by the witnesses.

Again, the witnesses will all be testifying from the witness stand right here. Your notes may help you refresh your recollection of the testimony and should be treated as a supplement to rather than a substitute for your memory. Your notes are only to be used by you as memory aids and should not take precedence over your independent recollection of the facts.

Those of you who do not wish to take notes

should not be overly influenced by the notes of other jurors. It is just as easy to write down something incorrectly as it is to remember it incorrectly and your fellow jurors' notes are entitled to no greater weight than each juror's independent memory.

Although you may refer to your notes during deliberations, give no more or less weight to the view of other fellow jurors just because that juror did or did not take notes. Although you are permitted to use your notes for your deliberations, the only notes you may use are the notes you write down in the courtroom during the proceedings on the materials distributed by court staff.

Each time that we adjourn, your notes will be collected and secured by the court staff. Your notes are completely confidential and neither I nor any member of the court staff will read your notes now or at any time in the future. After you have reached a verdict in this case, your notes will be destroyed immediately by court personnel.

You will only be permitted to take notes during the portion of the trial when evidence was presented. For example, you did not have the notepads for opening statements. You will not have the notepads for closing arguments nor for the instructions of the Court, only for the purpose of taking notes when someone

is testifying from the witness stand. 1 2 For those of you who wish to take notes, you 3 may now remove the pen and pad from your folders as we 4 are about to have the first witness. And, yes, they do make noise. 5 6 Okay. Is the Commonwealth ready to proceed? 7 MR. PORTMAN: Yes, we are, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Would you call your first witness. 9 10 MR. PORTMAN: Dan Licklider to the stand 11 please. 12 DANIEL O. LICKLIDER, called as a witness, having been duly sworn or affirmed, 13 was examined and testified as follows: 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. PORTMAN: 16 Good morning. Please state your name for the Ο. record and spell your first and last names. 17 18 Daniel O. Licklider. It's D-a-n-i-e-l; Α. 19 Licklider, L-i-c-k-l-i-d-e-r. 20 And Mr. Licklider, by whom are you employed? 21 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Office of the 22 Attorney General. 23 Q. And in what capacity? 24 The title is Field Investigator Supervisor, 25 Field Investigator, and also Narcotic Agent 3.

1 Q. And how long have you been employed by the 2 Office of the Attorney General? 3 Α. Thirty-four years. Over 34 years. Prior to that did you have any law 5 enforcement experience? 6 Α. No. I had college prior to that and 7 military. 8 And what, if any, special training have you Ο. 9 had as a narcotics officer or a Field Investigator? 10 I started work in 1973, went to Gannick 11 (phonetic) College -- that's where the training academy was -- and I performed undercover work from '73 to '86. 12 13 In 1987 we formed a financial investigation unit and I was assigned to that unit. Subsequently in 1991, I was 14 15 the -- became the field supervisor for that unit. 16 The name of the unit changed from the Financial Investigative Unit to the Money Laundering Unit 17 18 subsequently. 19 And did you have any special training with 20 respect to financial investigations slash money 21 laundering investigations? 22 Α. Yes, sir. I attended -- one's the FBI had an 23 academy I went to down in Quantico, Virginia. I went to 24 IRS schools, additional FBI, DEA schools, McLaughlin, 25 numerous -- numerous schools through the years.

And during your 34 years, did you participate 1 ο. 2 in any financial investigations prior to 2006? 3 Yes, sir. Α. Approximately how many? 4 Q. Separate from being the supervisor aspect? 5 Α. Start there. 6 Q. Personally, approximately -- do you want from 7 1987 up to -- I mean from the start of the financial 8 9 investigations? 10 Ο. That's fine. 11 At least a hundred, and that is a supervisor 12 being more than that because I had people that worked 13 under me, also. 14 Q. Okay. Starting in 2006 were you so involved 15 in the Money Laundering Investigation Unit? 16 Yes, sir. 17 And in 2006 did you become involved in an 18 investigation of Levi Lapp Stoltzfoos? 19 Α. Yes, sir, I did. 20 And can you please tell us how you became 21 involved in that investigation? 22 On or about February 13th, I received a phone 23 call from Lisa Krick, who is a BSA Compliance Officer --24 some banks called them compliance officers, some of them 25 call it security, they have various titles, but I

1 received a phone call from her.

- Q. Do you recall which bank she worked for?
- A. Yes. Susquehanna Bancshares.
- Q. As a result of that telephone call what, if any, action did you take?
- A. I initiated an investigation against

 Mr. Stoltzfoos. He's seated to the left of the defense

 counsel.
- Q. And what steps did you initially take for that investigation?
- A. From the information I received from Lisa Krick, we found that Mr. Stoltzfoos was making what appeared to be structured deposits throughout Lancaster County in a short time frame, and as a result of that I went around and conducted interviews and took the information, to put it in in preparation for a search warrant affidavit for each one of these financial institutions.

And the first wave of search warrants were executed about February 23rd, about ten days later. They were sealed search warrants. I had -- they were signed here by a Common Pleas Judge and they were executed on February 23rd.

Subsequently, there was a search warrant which I did. Again, it was a sealed search warrant we

executed at the residence of Levi Stoltzfoos. That was on or about March 30th of 2006. And then there was approximately two more search warrants done subsequent to the search warrant execution at the residence, and that was done -- I think one of the last banks that we did was Graystone Bank, New Holland. And then I did one at Blue Ball National Bank that was for just documents only.

- Q. Okay. With respect to the search warrant executed at the banks, how many banks did you identify as being involved with or flowing from the information you initially received from Miss Krick?
- A. Initially, information was approximately six banks.
- Q. And how many banks in total did you end up receiving information from with respect to Mr. Stoltzfoos' activities?
 - A. Ten.

MR. PORTMAN: May I approach the witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MR. PORTMAN:

Q. Mr. Licklider, I handed you what have been previously marked as Commonwealth Exhibits 1 through 10. Would you please look through those, see if you recognize those.

It's 11 Commonwealth Exhibits. 1 Α. 2 Sorry. One through 11. 3 With respect to Exhibit Number 1, can you 4 please tell us what that is? Yeah. This is the application for search 5 6 warrant authorization. It's Lancaster County and it's 7 for the Bank of Lancaster County. It has my signature on 8 it and it has the issue of authority with the Judge's signature, Judge Allison. And it has the date that I 9 10 served the search warrant -- that was February 23rd --11 and the date that the -- I signed before the Judge swore 12 to it was on the 22nd. 13 Now, with respect to Commonwealth Exhibit 1, 14 did you personally present that to the Bank of Lancaster 15 County? 16 Yes, sir, I did. 17 And as a result of presenting that, did you 18 receive any documents or other material from the bank? 19 Yes, sir, I did. Α. 20 What did you receive? 21 I received a cashier's check number 230408 in 22 the amount of \$78,612.11. And that was made out to the 23 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the Attorney General's Office. 24 25 Q. And any other documents?

Twenty-six monthly statements for Mr. Levi 1 Α. 2 Stoltzfoos' account; and it has the account number on there, his signature card for when he took out the 3 4 account, and cash-in transactions and deposit tickets and photographs of Mr. Stoltzfoos when he is inside of the 5 6 bank. 7 Q. Did the information you obtained indicate the 8 account number? 9 Yes, sir, it did. Α. 10 And can you please tell us what that number 11 was? 12 Sure. 9020010147. 13 Next, if you would please refer to 14 Commonwealth's Exhibit 2 for Coatesville Savings Bank. 15 Α. Yes, sir. 16 Could you please tell us when that was signed, executed and what, if anything, was received back 17 from the bank? 18 19 This one was for -- it's a sealed search 20 warrant signed before Judge Michael J. -- I apologize if 21 I --22 THE COURT: Perezous. 23 THE WITNESS: -- Perezous that was signed on 24 March 3rd, 2006. And it was executed the same day by 25 myself, on March 3rd, '06, and it was for Coatesville

Savings Bank. And it was, again, one of Mr. Levi Stoltzfoos' accounts.

- Q. Did you receive anything from this bank as a result of executing that search warrant?
- A. Yes, sir. I received a Coatesville Savings
 Bank official check number 012408 in the amount of
 \$35,758.91. The account number which this money came out
 of was 3026001651.

The signature cards, I received monthly statements, the deposit slips, withdrawal slips and I received some photocopies of the monies that were deposited by Mr. Stoltzfoos, the hundred-dollar bills.

There was some \$14,000 worth of photographs of the money, and there was a photograph -- an additional photograph of Mr. Stoltzfoos.

- Q. Next I'd like to direct your attention to what's been previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 3 for Ephrata National Bank. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Could you please tell us when that was signed, executed, and whether or not you personally executed that search warrant?
- A. Yes, sir. It was -- again, it was another sealed search warrant signed by Judge Allison. I swore to it, signed it on February 22nd. It was executed the

next day, on February 23rd, at Ephrata National Bank, Hinkletown Office in New Holland.

The account number was 882011. I received a cashier's check number 3923 in the amount of \$48,251.85. I received monthly statements, signature cards, copy of deposit slips, videotapes this time of the deposits, transactions.

- Q. Next I'd like to direct your attention to what was previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 4 for Fulton Bank. You recognize that?
- A. Yes, sir, I do. It's another -- it's another sealed search warrant which I swore to it and signed before Judge Allison here in the County on February 22nd. It was Fulton Bank, 696 East Main Street, New Holland. It's one of Mr. Stoltzfoos' accounts.

I received a Fulton Bank check number 0988601 in the amount of \$54,212.79. I received signature cards, monthly statements, deposit items, withdrawal tickets, a retail account agreement, and this time there was digital surveillance photographs of Mr. Stoltzfoos making the deposits. This account number was 362268587.

- Q. Next directing your attention to what was previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 5 for Graystone Bank. Again, do you recognize that document?
 - A. Yes, sir, I do. It's another one which I

signed on this date, April 3rd. The Honorable Judge

Joseph C. Madenspacher. Apologize, Your Honor. I'm not
familiar with the judges' names around here.

Okay. This is -- it was on account number for Mr. Stoltzfoos 210002077. Mr. Stoltzfoos. I executed it on the same day, April 3rd, '06. I received a check, Graystone Bank check number 1453 in the amount of \$48,115.29.

I received monthly statements for account number 210002077, signature cards and account number and -- a signature card with the same account number on it, miscellaneous documents and deposit tickets. Again, that was a sealed search warrant as well as the other ones.

- Q. Right. Directing your attention then to Commonwealth's Exhibit 6, M&T Bank. Do you recognize that document?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Can you please tell us what that is?
- A. Again, it's a sealed search warrant and it was -- I signed it and swore to it before Judge Allison on February 22nd, '06. I executed it at M&T Bank, 210 East Main Street, New Holland on February 23rd.

I received M&T Bank official bank check number 288625251, and it was in the amount of \$66,138.61.

I received a transaction statement. I received photocopies of \$9,000 from one of Mr. Stoltzfoos' deposits. It was photocopied.

- Q. Anything else that you received from the bank?
- A. And it says pending surveillance photographs of cash deposits by Mr. Stoltzfoos.
- Q. And with respect to Commonwealth's Exhibit 7, do you recognize that document?
- A. Yes, sir. That's another sealed search warrant. I swore to it on February 22nd before

 Judge Allison and I executed it the following day,

 February 23rd, at National Penn Bank, 301 West Main

 Street in New Holland. Again, it was on Mr. Stoltzfoos' accounts. The account number was 215641620.

I received the official bank check number 1009 in the amount of \$66,700, and I received approximately 46 documents; monthly statements and various deposit tickets.

- Q. Referring you now to what was previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 8, please take a look at that. And do you recognize that?
- A. Yes, sir. Again, that's a sealed search warrant on one of Mr. Stoltzfoos' accounts at Northwest Savings Bank. The account number was 1711015709. I

swore to it on February 22nd, '06 before Judge Allison and I executed it the following day, on February 23rd.

I received an official bank check number 250642254 in the amount of \$57,271.60. I also received deposit slips, currency statements, signature card and six surveillance photographs. And, again, I'm not sure if I said this account number, but it was 1711.

- Q. Referring your attention now to what was previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 9 for Sovereign Bank. Do you recognize that?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Could you please tell us about that document?
- A. Yes. Again, it's a sealed search warrant which I swore to and signed before Judge Allison. This happened on February 22nd, '06 for the Sovereign Bank, 689 West Main Street, New Holland. And the account number was 0022019944. Again, it's one of the Levi Stoltzfoos' accounts. I executed it the next day.

I received eight surveillance photographs, four monthly statements, I received deposit slips and various opening documents. And I received an official bank check 6058858 in the amount of \$56,724.55.

Q. Now, referring your attention to what was previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 10, do you recognize that?

1 Α. Yes, sir. 2 Can you please tell us about that? 3 Yes, sir. It's, again, a sealed search warrant which I signed and swore before Judge Allison 4 5 here in the -- at -- on February 22nd, '06, Susquehanna 6 Bancshares, 3433 Old Philadelphia Pike, Intercourse, 7 Pennsylvania. The account number was 10001385466. It's 8 for Levi Stoltzfoos and the next day I executed it. 9 received an official check, 14 photographs, a signature 10 card, monthly statements and an account agreement and 11 deposit slips and deposit inquiries. 12 Q. Can you please tell us the amount on the 13 check that was received? 14 MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, I'm going to object. 15 If I could just for a moment. 16 I'll withdraw the objection, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Conrad. 18 THE WITNESS: For some reason the amount's 19 not written on -- the check number is written on it, but 20 not the amount. 21 BY MR. PORTMAN: 22 Ο. Okay. Now, with each of the ten checks that you testified to receiving, with the exception of not 23 24 having the amount for the Susquehanna Bancshares' check, 25 what, if anything, did you do with each of those checks?

We had called an Asset Forfeiture 1 Α. 2 Administrator and I turned them over to her. 3 And what would be the procedure for the asset Ο. administrator to do with those checks, if you know? 4 5 Yes, I know. That money is -- the Office of 6 the Attorney General has an account which they put that 7 money in to get interest on it. 8 So in short, the Office of the Attorney 9 General deposited that money into a bank account? 10 Α. That's correct. 11 Next I'd like to direct your attention to 12 what was previously marked as Commonwealth's Exhibit 11. 13 Do you have that? 14 Yes, sir. Α. 15 And can you please identify that for us? 16 Yes, sir. This is a sealed search warrant 17 which I swore to here in the County on March 31st, 2006 18 -- no, it's not. March 29th, 2006. Pardon me. That's March 29th, 2006; and I executed it the next day, on 19 20 March 30th, 2006. 21 0. And where was that executed at? 22 Α. That was executed at Mr. Stoltzfoos' parents' 23 house where he resided. 24 And what was the address that the search 25 warrant was executed at?